

The Emperor Domitian and Literature

by K. M. COLEMAN, Cape Town

Contents

Introduction	3087
I. Domitian's writings	3088
II. Domitian as sponsor of literature	3095
III. Domitian and freedom of expression	3111

Introduction

Aspects of Domitian's policy towards literature are covered individually in detailed studies of authors or topics. Brief synopses are provided by the historians of his reign.¹ The only detailed study devoted to the topic is a chapter by BARDON.² My discussion is intended to draw together the relevant (often incidental)

References to journals follow the abbreviations in 'L'Année Philologique'. In addition, the following works will be cited according to the abbreviations given:

- CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Berlin 1863-.
- ILS = Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae ed. H. DESSAU, Berlin 1892-1916.
- PIR = Prosopographia Imperii Romani, Berlin 1898.
- PIR² = Prosopographia Imperii Romani 2nd edition, Berlin 1933-.
- RE = Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart 1894-.
- TLL = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig 1900-.

The Oxford Classical Texts of Martial (LINDSAY), the younger Pliny (MYNORS), Quintilian (WINTERBOTTOM) and Statius (POSTGATE) have been followed; otherwise, quotations are from Teubner texts.

All dates, unless otherwise indicated, are A.D.

¹ S. GSELL, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien*, Paris 1894 (repr. Rome 1967); A. GARZETTI, *From Tiberius to the Antonines*, tr. J. R. FOSTER, London 1974; H. BENGTSON, *Die Flavii*, Munich 1979.

² H. BARDON, *Les Empereurs et les Lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien*, Paris 1940 (henceforward cited as 'Empereurs').

remarks made by scholars on related issues and at the same time to produce a catalogue of ancient sources for Domitian's attitude to literature.

The youthful predilections of Domitian might suggest that a concern for literature would be manifest under his rule. Vespasian had cultivated a Flavian atmosphere distinct from the idiosyncrasies of Nero's reign.³ The Flavian heirs in turn had to sustain the Flavian tone. A conscious attempt by Domitian to appear dissimilar to Nero has been adduced to explain why he abandoned his literary activities upon his accession to power.⁴ Similarities nevertheless persisted, especially a taste for Greek-style literary competitions. The atmosphere looks favourable for literary composition; but the sources charge Domitian with having suppressed independent thought and expression. The contradiction between encouragement and restriction underlies the history of Domitian's attitude to writing and writers.

I. Domitian's writings

It is undisputed that Domitian showed an interest in literature in his youth. His motive is debated. Tacitus allows him no credit (Hist. 4.86.2): *studiumque litterarum et amorem carminum simulans, quo velaret animum et fratris (se) aemulationi subduceret* (sic. HALM: *aemulationi (se) subduceret* KIESSLING: *subduceretur* recc.), *cuius disparem mitioremque naturam contra interpretabatur*. The charge of hypocrisy is also laid by Suetonius, evincing as evidence Domitian's subsequent neglect of all activity approximating to literary creativity (Dom. 2.2): *simulavit et ipse mire modestiam in primisque poeticae studium, tam insuetum antea sibi quam postea spretum et abiectum, recitavitque etiam publice*.⁵ Failure to continue composing is interpreted by both Tacitus and Suetonius as proof that Domitian's early literary interests were faked. The true explanation may be his conscientious devotion to state affairs and to the legislative business⁶ to which he was temperamentally suited; after his accession he limited his reading strictly to the archives compiled by Tiberius (Suet. Dom. 20): *praeter commentarios et acta Tiberi Caesaris nihil lectitabat*.⁷ Titus had had the good fortune to die rel-

³ See M. P. CHARLESWORTH, *Flaviana*, JRS 27 (1937) 56.

⁴ BARDON, *Empereurs*, 284.

⁵ Suetonius' assertion is formulated via a rhetorical figure (note the correlative *tam . . . quam*), which suggests that *spretum et abiectum* may be an exaggeration to achieve the desired balance, and thus need not be taken absolutely literally.

⁶ Domitian's diligence in attending to affairs of state was matter for a fervent compliment from Quintilian (Inst. Or. 10.1.91): *Germanicum Augustum ab institutis studiis deflexit cura terrarum, parumque dis visum est esse eum maximum poetarum*. A summary of the evidence for his administrative flair is furnished by GARZETTI, *op. cit.* (see note 1), 276 ff., with bibliography at 645.

⁷ BARDON, *loc. cit.*, takes this phrase to mean that Tiberius' works were Domitian's preferred reading, to which he returned over and over again. But Suetonius commonly uses fre-

atively young, his reign short enough for him to have implemented nothing controversial, and his persona of affability and charisma intact.⁸ After his premature death, Domitian, aged twenty-nine, was subjected to the gaze of a public and a posterity both resentful and hypercritical. MORFORD,⁹ analysing how Vespasian prepared his sons for the succession, remarks that Vespasian could reasonably have anticipated that Titus' reign would allow Domitian a long period for training and adjustment; hence Titus' death left his brother ill-prepared to succeed him.

Favourable sources claim for the youthful Domitian genuine literary talent. Quintilian, discussing epic, describes his style as superlative in grandeur, erudition and polish (10.1.91): *quid tamen his ipsis eius operibus in quae donato imperio inuenis secesserat sublimius, doctius, omnibus denique numeris praestantius?* This is Quintilian's only reference to Domitian's poetry; its effusiveness and brevity have appeared paradoxical. KENNEDY¹⁰ argues that silence or criticism would have been construed as disrespect.

Tacitus believes that Domitian's literary efforts were motivated by jealousy of Titus. BARDON¹¹ adopts this interpretation so that it reflects some credit upon Domitian, because he notes the implication that Domitian recognized Titus' cultural accomplishments. But Tacitus' phrase could mean that Domitian was jealous of the public acclaim which Titus attracted, and it might not imply that Domitian himself recognized Titus' talent. The elder Pliny affords a different perspective on the same issue; he claims that Titus is as good a poet as Domitian (NH Praef. 5), which indicates that Domitian showed talent and was respected for it: *quantus in poetica es (Tite)! o magna fecunditas animi! quem ad modum fratrem quoque imitaberis excogitasti.* Thus Pliny agrees with Tacitus and Suetonius that Titus and Domitian were literary rivals, but he implies that Domitian established his reputation first.

Quintilian pays Domitian a dual compliment by claiming that personal experience qualified him as an epic poet (10.1.91): *quis enim caneret bella melius quam qui sic gerit?* Statius pays a similar compliment, exploiting the dual significance of the laurel-wreath to denote preeminence as warrior or composer (Ach. 1.16–17): *... cui geminae florent vatūque ducūque / certatim laurus.* In an epigram addressed to Domitian's librarian, Sextus, Martial refers to an epic. It is not clear whether he means that the author is Sextus or Domitian. The subject is the siege of the Capitol in 69 (Mart. 5.5.7): *ad Capitolini caelestia carmina belli / grande cothurnati pone Maronis opus.* BARDON¹² suggests that Quintilian's remark may not be a generalization but a specific reference to an autobiographical

quentative forms without any frequentative force (see G. W. MOONEY [ed.], C. Suetoni Tranquilli De Vita Caesarum, London 1930, repr. Illinois 1979, 623), and in collocation with *nihil* the reference is unambiguously to Domitian's exclusive reading.

⁸ See the assessment by R. SYME, Tacitus, Oxford 1958, 45 (henceforward cited as 'Tacitus').

⁹ M. P. O. MORFORD, The Training of Three Roman Emperors, Phoenix 22 (1968) 57–72.

¹⁰ G. KENNEDY, An Estimate of Quintilian, AJPh 88 (1962) 133.

¹¹ BARDON, Empereurs, 281.

¹² BARDON, Empereurs, 282–283.

epic; as suitable material he offers Domitian's campaign against the Chatti in 82¹³ or that of 88. But such a work would totally invalidate Suetonius' assertion that Domitian ceased to write after his accession (Dom. 2.2, cit. above; but this is perhaps not literally true: see footnote 5). Quintilian seems to refer to martial epic which Domitian wrote before his accession, but with hindsight he implies that Domitian's choice of a war-theme was borne out by his subsequent military victories.

Quintilian's equation of writing martial epic and conducting wars suggests war against a foreign enemy rather than civil war. Thus Martial's ambiguous reference to a poem on the fall of the Capitol (5.5.7, cit. above) is not relevant. There is extant evidence of a poem by Domitian about Titus' campaign in Judaea which culminated in the destruction of Jerusalem in 70; the evidence depends upon the interpretation of the proem to Valerius Flaccus' 'Argonautica', addressed to Vespasian. Both the text of this passage and the dating of the 'Argonautica' are in dispute; detailed discussion is required, starting from the Teubner text edited by COURTNEY (1971):

... tuque o, pelagi cui maior aperti	7
fama, Caledonius postquam tua carbasa vexit	
Oceanus Phrygios prius indignatus Iulos,	
eripe me populis et habenti nubila terrae,	
namque potes, veterumque fave, venerande, canenti	13 a/11 b
facta virum: versam proles tua pandit Idumen,	12
sancte pater, Solymo nigrantem (et) pulvere fratrem	11 a/13 b
spargentemque faces et in omni turre furentem.	14
ille tibi cultusque deum delubraque gentis	
instituet, cum tu, genitor, lucebis ab omni	
parte poli . . .	
... nunc nostra serenus	20
orsa iuves, haec ut Latias vox impleat urbes.	

The theory of GETTY,¹⁴ that Valerius Flaccus began the 'Argonautica' after Vespasian's death and invoked him at the beginning to avoid the invidious choice between Titus and Domitian, is based upon: (i) the reference at 1.15 to the college of Sodales Flaviales established by Titus after Vespasian's death, and (ii) the sentiment expressed by lines 10–11 and the adjective *serenus* (20) which are appropriate to an addressee whose apotheosis has been achieved or is imminently anticipated. GETTY also argues that the temple referred to at line 15 is the Templum Divi Vespasiani begun by Titus c. 80 and dedicated by Domitian as the Templum Vespasiani et Titi. Hence a date c. 81 for the beginning of the

¹³ Domitian appears to have undertaken his manoeuvres against the Chatti in 82, not in 83; see B. W. JONES, The Dating of Domitian's War against the Chatti, *Historia* 22 (1973) 79–90.

¹⁴ R. J. GETTY, The Date of Composition of the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, *CPh* 31 (1936) 53–61; cf. M. SCAFFAI, Rassegna di studi su Valerio Flacco (1938–1983), above in this same volume (ANRW II 32.4) 2368–2373.

'Argonautica' seems plausible. SMALLWOOD¹⁵ supports this by accounting for the epithet *Caledonius* (8) as Flavian propaganda: Vespasian had participated in Claudius' British campaigns, but Caledonia was not penetrated until Agricola's campaign c. 80. Hence Valerius flatters the Flavians by attributing to Vespasian a contemporary historical feat. Thus COURTNEY restores the MS *pandit* (12) for the emendation *pandet*; Domitian was currently engaged on his epic when Valerius embarked on his. This date does not contradict Suetonius' assertion that Domitian abandoned composition when he acceded to power.

The crucial issue is the asyndeton at line 13.¹⁶ COURTNEY, following GETTY, postulates that *et* fell out after *nigrantem*. WASZINK,¹⁷ however, rejects COURTNEY's insertion of *et* and retains the asyndeton, taking *Solymo . . . fratrem* in apposition to *versam . . . Idumen*: he explains *versam Idumen* as equivalent to *eversorem Idumes*.¹⁸ WASZINK concludes that Domitian's work in progress was a *Panegyricus Titi*. An alternative interpretation, however, is conveyed if the asyndeton is removed: Domitian's poem was about the Jewish War and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; in a martial epic the element of panegyric could have bulked large. If Domitian had attempted a formal panegyric, Suetonius' silence about it would be remarkable. Quintilian 10.1.91 (cit. above) implies that martial epic was Domitian's preferred genre.

BARDON,¹⁹ taking as evidence Martial's mention of a poem on the siege of the Capitol (if it was by Domitian), Valerius' evidence for the poem on the Jewish War, and his own hypothesis about an autobiographical epic (see above, p. 3090), suggests that Domitian wrote historical epic on Flavian themes to compensate for the Flavians' lack of historical tradition; Vespasian's memoirs (Jos. Ap. 1.10, Vit. 65) served this purpose. The hypothesis is plausible; but it is notable that for contemporary epic poets a Flavian theme was not a prerequisite for publication.

Domitian's knowledge of literature was underpinned by the conventional grounding in the classics. His extant quotations are from Homer and Vergil,²⁰ perhaps determined by what would be familiar to his audience; they may not reflect the scope of his own tastes in reading. Domitian's fondness for the apt

¹⁵ E. MARY SMALLWOOD, Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* I 5–21, Mnem. IV, 15 (1962) 171.

¹⁶ The MS *namque potes* at line 13 creates an awkward parenthesis and is thus usually emended to *namque potest*. COURTNEY, following GETTY, art. cit. (see note 14), 269, exchanges *namque potes* and *sancte pater* (11) to eliminate the parenthesis.

¹⁷ J. H. WASZINK, Valerius Flaccus *Argon.* I 13, Mnem. IV, 24 (1971) 299.

¹⁸ WASZINK adduces as a parallel Verg. Aen. 11.268: *devictam Asiam* (metonymy for *victorem Asiae*).

¹⁹ BARDON, *Empereurs*, 283.

²⁰ In proposing to ban the sacrifice of oxen he quoted Georgics 2.536: *impia quam caesis gens est epulata iuvencis* (Suet. Dom. 9.1); jealous that the retinue of his cousin Flavius Sabinus wore white tunics, he quoted Iliad 2.204: οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη (Suet. Dom. 12.3), a line which continued in a vein suitable for quotation by autocrats, as Gaius had noticed (Suet. Gaius 22.1): εἰς κοίρανος ἔστω, εἰς βασιλεὺς. Iliad 21.108 is cited by Suetonius (Dom. 18.2) from Domitian's tract on the care of the hair: οὐχ ὀράας, οἷος κἀγὼ καλὸς τε μέγας τε;

quotation is consonant with his own pithy turn of phrase: *sermonis tamen* (. . .) *nec inelegantis, dictorum interdum etiam notabilium* (Suet. Dom. 20).²¹ The contemporary taste for epigram accords with the terse expression of Domitian's sardonic wit. In the spirit of Martial is his bon mot *vellem tam formosus esse quam Maecius sibi videtur* (ibid.).

In a similar vein of sardonic paradox he comments on the public attitude to state security (ibid.): *condicionem principum miserrimam aiebat, quibus de coniuratione comperta non crederetur nisi occisis*.²² Some of Domitian's sayings gained currency (Suet. Dom. 9.3): *ferebaturque vox eius: princeps qui delatores non castigat, irritat*; this remark was part of an edict (Dio 67.1.4). Another was perhaps intended to defend Domitian's programme which encouraged court literature (Dio 67.2.3.): τὸ δ' ὅλον ἔλεγε τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας τοὺς μὴ πολλοὺς κολάζοντας οὐκ ἀγαθοὺς ἀλλ' εὐτυχεῖς εἶναι.

Familiarity with the classics and a neat turn of phrase offer no clue to identify Domitian's tutors in literature and rhetoric.²³ He spoke in public at the age of eighteen during the crises of 69–70: to the Senate (Tac. Hist. 4.40, 44, 47) and to mutinous praetorians (Tac. Hist. 4.46); thus MORFORD²⁴ observes that his early education was competent and thorough, and practice in public speaking was part of his training.²⁵ CURCIO²⁶ was the first to postulate that Domitian may have received religious instruction from the elder Papinius, father of Statius; the evidence adduced is Silvae 5.3.178–180, addressed to Statius' father: *sub te Dardanius facis explorator opertae / qui Diomedei celat penetralia furti, / crevit et inde sacrum didicit puer*.²⁷ Hence Domitian in his youth was in the charge of

²¹ The use of *nec* as a negating particle without a copulative function is an archaism paralleled nowhere in Suetonius; see M. LEUMANN, J. B. HOFMANN, A. SZANTYR, *Lateinische Grammatik II*, Munich 1965, 448–449. Hence I have here departed from the Teubner text to adopt the lacuna, recorded in the apparatus criticus, which BÜCHELER postulated to account for an alternative introduced by a corresponding *nec*.

²² Domitian's capacity for aphorism was an embarrassment to later detractors; Marcus Aurelius is said to have preferred to attribute this remark to Hadrian rather than follow the traditional ascription to Domitian, since Domitian's reputation diminished its moralistic value (SHA Avid. Cass. 2.5–6): *'misera conditio imperatorum, quibus de adfecta(ta) tyrannide nisi occisis non potest credi'. eius autem exemplum ponere (malui) quam Domitiani, qui hoc primus dixisse fertur; tyrannorum enim etiam bona dicta non habent tantum auctoritatis, quantum debent*.

²³ Quintilian must be ruled out as Domitian's tutor, because he only reached Rome in 68 and possibly did not open a school until several years later (see note 132); it seems very unlikely that Vespasian would entrust the last years of his heir's education to an unproven teacher.

²⁴ MORFORD, art. cit. (see note 9), 69–70.

²⁵ Titus too had become a good speaker: *summa eloquentia, summa eruditione praeditum* (Plin. NH Praef. 11); *facundissimus . . . causas latine egit* (Eutrop. 7.14). See S. FRANCHET D'ESPÈREY, *Vespasien, Titus et la littérature*, above in this same volume (ANRW II 32.5) 3051, 3054 ff.

²⁶ G. CURCIO, *Studio su P. Papinio Stazio*, Catania 1898, 8.

²⁷ In *facis explorator opertae* Statius is alluding to the investigation of the case involving the Vestal Cornelia in A.D. 90 (Plin. Ep. 4.11, Suet. Dom. 8) which led to her re-trial at Domitian's Alban villa, cf. Silv. 1.1.35–36: . . . *an tacita vigilet face Troicus ignis / atque*

the elder Papinius (*sub te . . . crevit*) and learnt religious lore (*sacrum*) from him. It is uncertain whether Papinius taught him religion only or a wider curriculum.²⁸

Of Domitian's prose style brief specimens have survived. When the death penalty was passed by the Senate on persons condemned for *maiestas*, Domitian used his tribunician veto (the emperor's tool for exercising clemency in such contexts) so that they could choose the manner of their execution (Suet. Dom. 11.3):

deinde atrocitate poenae conterritus, ad leniendam invidiam intercessit his verbis — neque enim ab re fuerit ipsa cognoscere —: permittite, patres conscripti, a pietate vestra impetrari, quod scio me difficulter impetraturum, ut damnatis liberum mortis arbitrium indulgeatis; nam et parcetis oculis vestris et intellegent me omnes senatui interfuisse.

The style of this extract is analysed inaccurately by BARDON;²⁹ he detects a conscious arrangement of word-endings in *damnatis liberum mortis arbitrium*, disregarding the difference in syllabic quantities. He also, however, notes the Ciceronian double *et* and the post-classical accusative after *indulgere*.³⁰ This may point to a classicizing tendency in Domitian's expression while his syntax reflects contemporary usage, but a general conclusion is not possible from the evidence of one brief extract.

Suetonius assumes that Domitian neglected administration which required any literary format (Dom. 20): *epistulas orationesque et edicta alieno formabat ingenio*. A concern with titulature is quoted by Suetonius as evidence of Domitian's megalomania; Suetonius asserts that he prescribed the heading for an official letter written in the name of the procurators (Dom. 13.2): *pari arrogantia, cum procuratorum suorum nomine formalem dictaret epistulam, sic coepit: dominus et deus noster hoc fieri iubet*. Hence Domitian engaged in the normal imperial practice of dictating official letters.³¹

A letter from Domitian to Lappius Maximus,³² regarding a grant of exemption to the philosopher Archippus, is quoted at Plin. Ep. 10.58.6. From its simple style BARDON³³ deduces that it was written by Domitian himself or supervised by him. The stylistic argument is weak, since a competent secretary would compose in the required style; more important is the lack of evidence that any imperial secretary at the end of the first century composed letters for the emperor in

exploratas iam laudet Vesta ministras. The periphrasis *Dardanius explorator* must therefore refer to Domitian, in his rôle as pontifex maximus, conducting the investigation into the case.

²⁸ Statius' description of his father's syllabus at Naples (Silv. 5.3.146–161) concentrates exclusively on Greek literature.

²⁹ BARDON, *Empereurs*, 287.

³⁰ TLL 7. 1253. 73 s. v. *indulgere* II.

³¹ See F. MILLAR, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, London 1977, 220.

³² For Lappius Maximus see A. GARZETTI, *Nerva*, Rome 1950, 136–7, *Senatores certi no.* 86. The correct form of his name, mistakenly read as L. Appius Maximus from Dio 67. 11.1 and Ep. de Caes. 11.10, is restored by the *Fasti Ostienses* and a diploma (AE 1949, 23 and 1961, 319).

³³ BARDON, *Empereurs*, 285.

Latin.³⁴ Thus it is reasonable to assume that Domitian formulated the wording of this letter; hence the clear and unpretentious style is his own:

Archippum philosophum, bonum virum et professioni suae etiam moribus respondentem, commendatum habeas velim, mi Maxime, et plenam ei humanitatem tuam praestes in iis, quae verecunde a te desideraverit.

The wry implication in *etiam*, that Archippus conformed to the stereotype of a philosopher, harmonises with Domitian's sardonic sense of humour.³⁵

BARDON³⁶ notes the difference in the style of Domitian's letter to Terentius Maximus on the same issue (Plin. Ep. 10.58.5):

Flavius Archippus philosophus impetravit a me, ut agrum ei ad c̄ circa Prusiam†, patriam suam, emi iuberem, cuius reditu suos alere posset. quod ei praestari volo. summam expensam liberalitati meae feres.

BARDON accounts for this terse, impersonal style by postulating that either it was an official letter, not a personal one, or else Domitian disliked the addressee. The most obvious explanation is simply that Domitian was better acquainted with Lappius Maximus.

For letters from Domitian in Greek it is plausible to postulate the rôle of an *ab epistulis Graecis*, as under Nero,³⁷ although it is still not clear whether this office involved taking dictation, or translating from Latin, or was perhaps even extended to composition.³⁸

Domitian's only recorded work in prose, apart from official documents, is a treatise on hair-care which he dedicated to a friend (Suet. Dom. 18.2): (*libellum*) *de cura capillorum ad amicum edidit*; it included Homeric quotation³⁹ and

³⁴ MILLAR, op.cit. (see note 31), 225. MILLAR's conclusion is more convincing than that of O. A. W. DILKE, *The Literary Output of the Roman Emperors*, GR II, 4 (1957) 81, who refuses to draw from the extant fragments of Domitian's letters conclusions about his style, on the grounds that it is impossible to ascertain what should not be attributed to secretaries. It should be noted that a division of labour occurs between the composition of a letter and the addition of documentary enclosures; when Domitian intervened in the dispute between Falerii and Firmum in 82, he composed a letter to the magistrates and council of Falerii which refers to instructions for appending the verdict which he had delivered after hearing the case: *quid constituerem de subsicivis cognita causa inter vos et Firmanos ut notum haberetis huic epistulae subici iussi* (CIL 9.5420 = *Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani*² no. 75).

³⁵ Cf. Pius' comment about the scarcity of philosophers (Dig. 27.1.6.7).

³⁶ BARDON, loc.cit. (see note 33).

³⁷ Nero's *ab epistulis Graecis*: Jos. Ant. 20.9 (183–4). Plin. Ep. 10.65 mentions letters by all three Flavian emperors to the Lacedaemonians, presumably in Greek. A letter in Greek from Domitian in 90 concerning the Pythian Games is partially preserved in an inscription (Bull. hell. 6 [1882] 451; DITTENBERGER, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*³, Leipzig 1917, no. 821).

³⁸ MILLAR, op.cit. (see note 31), 226–227. MILLAR interprets Jos. Ant. 20.9 (183–4) to mean that Beryllus, *ab epistulis Graecis* of Nero, himself wrote a letter to the Greeks in Caesarea on Nero's behalf invalidating Jewish rights there.

³⁹ See note 20.

philosophizing commonplaces about the ephemeral nature of human existence and beauty, which accord with the epigrammatic aphorisms (see above, p. 3092) for which he had some renown (*ibid.*):

*eadem me tamen manent capillorum fata et forti animo fero comam in
adulescentia senescentem. scias nec gratius quicquam decore nec brevius.*

BARDON⁴⁰ infers from *in adulescentia* that Domitian wrote the treatise in his youth; this fits Suetonius' assertion that upon his accession Domitian gave up literary pursuits. The short extract displays the same sardonic humour apparent in Domitian's *bons mots* (discussed above, p. 3092), and it is likewise expressed by a deliberate choice of words: the ironical tone of *fata capillorum* and *forti animo*, and the paradoxical juxtaposition of *in adulescentia senescentem*.⁴¹

The extant quotations from what Domitian said and wrote indicate that he was a man to display an interest in rhetoric; he respected classical epic; he had a taste for wry twists and epigrammatic expressions. Literary talent was displayed by both Vespasian's sons, mutual rivals; and when Domitian acceded to power he displayed a conscientious concern for government and legislature which afford a reason for the abandoning of his literary pursuits.

II. Domitian as sponsor of literature

Suetonius, while asserting that Domitian utterly neglected literature after his accession, admits that his policy regarding libraries was an exception to this generalization (Suet. Dom. 20): *quanquam bibliothecas incendio absumptas impensissime reparare curasset*. BARDON⁴² notes that the Flavian building-programme must have helped to motivate Domitian to undertake restoration. The identification of the *bibliothecas* to which Suetonius refers depends upon the interpretation of the plural form: MACÉ⁴³ concludes that Suetonius always uses the plural in referring to the library in the Porticus Octaviae; this library was burnt down in 80 and is thus usually identified⁴⁴ as the one Suetonius meant. GSELL⁴⁵ suggests

⁴⁰ BARDON, *Empereurs*, 281. ⁴¹ Noted *inter alia* by BARDON, *ibid.*

⁴² BARDON, *Empereurs*, 309.

⁴³ A. MACÉ, *Essai sur Suétone*, Paris 1900, 222.

⁴⁴ The building of this library is ascribed to Augustus when he restored the Porticus Octaviae in 33 B.C. (Suet. Aug. 29). DZIATZKO, *RE* 3.1 (1897).418 s.v. Bibliotheken, assumes that it is the same as the library dedicated in the name of Marcellus (Plut. Marc. 30.6). It has been shown by L. RICHARDSON, JR., *The Evolution of the Porticus Octaviae*, *AJA* 80 (1976) 62–63, that it was indeed the same library, but that Octavia had the complex adjacent to the Porticus rebuilt in 23 B.C. and it was she who added the library, not Augustus. Cf. Suet. Gramm. 21.2, and the elder Pliny's habit of referring to this complex as *opera Octaviae*, e.g. at *NH* 34.31. These buildings were amongst the casualties in the fire of A.D. 80 (Dio 66.24).

⁴⁵ GSELL, *op. cit.* (see note 1), S. B. PLATNER and T. ASHBY, *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1929, 297–303.

the library of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, rebuilt by Vespasian after the storming of the Capitol in 69, burnt down again in 80 and restored by Domitian; however, there is no record that this temple did have a library.

Martial refers to restoration of the library of the Templum Augusti Novum⁴⁶ after it had been damaged by fire (Mart. 12.2 [3].7–8): *iure tuo veneranda novipete limina templi, / reddita Pierio sunt ubi templa* (sic recc.: *tecta* HEINSIUS) *choro*. Since this epigram is dated to 101, the restoration cannot be attributed unequivocally to Domitian, but the building operations may have considerably preceded the re-shelving of the books: FRIEDLÄNDER⁴⁷ deduces that the books themselves had only just been restored in 101. It is possible that Suetonius' remark (quoted above) refers generally to more than one loss in the fire of 80; the Bibliotheca Ulpia, sited in the vicinity of the devastated area, may have been built to replace the library of Asinius Pollio in the Atrium Libertatis and may perhaps have been started by Domitian.⁴⁸

The Flavian cult of Minerva,⁴⁹ begun by Vespasian, also guaranteed Domitian's interest in libraries. Both the Flavian building-programme and the cult of Minerva were propagandist channels which associated material and intellectual advancement with the imperial family. Martial's apostrophe to the librarian Sextus is interpreted by SCOTT⁵⁰ as evidence that the libraries on the Palatine were entrusted to Minerva's care (Mart. 5.5.1): *Sexte, Palatinae cultor facunde Minervae*. Domitian's enthusiasm for Minerva may thus be interpreted partly as a manifestation of his interest in literature. But his concern for libraries was more profound than mere propaganda. In restoring what had been destroyed by fire, he searched widely for replacement copies and he sent copyists to Alexandria to reproduce the original stock there (Suet. Dom. 20): *exemplaribus undique petitis missisque Alexandream qui describerent emendarentque*. Such a costly exercise with relatively little mob-appeal suggests genuine academic concern rather than pure self-advertisement.

⁴⁶ The library in the Templum (divi) Augusti (or: Templum Novum) was founded by Tiberius (Suet. Tib. 74): RE 18.3 (1949). 67–68 s.v. Palatium (ZIEGLER).

⁴⁷ L. FRIEDLÄNDER, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*, Leipzig 1886 (repr. Amsterdam 1961).

⁴⁸ The hypothesis that the Forum Traiani was built on the site of the Atrium Libertatis is almost discounted by PLATNER and ASHBY, *op. cit.* (see note 45), 56. Aur. Vict. Caes. 13.5 suggests that Domitian began work on Trajan's forum: *adhuc Romae a Domitiano coepta forum atque alia multa plusquam magnifice coluit ornavitque*.

⁴⁹ See: F. SAUTER, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*, Stuttgart–Berlin 1934 (henceforward cited as 'Kaiserkult'); K. SCOTT, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*, Stuttgart–Berlin 1936 (henceforward cited as 'Imperial Cult'); G. THIELE, *Die Poesie unter Domitian*, *Hermes* 51 (1916) 242 and n. 5. SCOTT, *Imperial Cult*, 171, notes that Minerva was a suitable patron for an emperor who aspired to both military glory and intellectual pursuits. The most extreme aspect of Domitian's veneration for Minerva was his claim to be her son: he imprisoned a magistrate at Tarentum who, in a sacrificial prayer, omitted to mention Domitian's filial relationship with her (Philostr. Vit. Apoll. 7.24). Cf. also J.-L. GIRARD, *Domitien et Minerve: une prédilection impériale*, ANRW II 17.1, ed. by W. HAASE, Berlin–New York 1981, 233–245.

⁵⁰ SCOTT, *Imperial Cult*, 171.

Opportunities for virtuoso literary performance were considerably increased by Domitian's promotion of literary contests. His innovations were the Capitoline Games in 86, which were a public foundation with a priestly college, and the Alban Games, which were sponsored privately by the emperor and held at his own residence.⁵¹ THIELE⁵² is mistaken in attributing to Domitian the introduction of Greek games to Rome: Nero had pre-empted him in A.D. 60 with the Neronia,⁵³ but they lapsed with his assassination. The tradition of Greek games in Italy was well established with the Augustalia at Naples, Ἰταλικά Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ Ἰσολύμπια, already by Strabo's time the equal of all except the four most famous games in Greece.⁵⁴

Domitian took a personal interest in the Capitoline Games, founded to celebrate the restoration of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.⁵⁵ He presided over them wearing Greek dress.⁵⁶ The rôle of agonothele at Greek games had on occasion been assumed by kings (Philip II and III) and also by a Roman general victorious in Macedonia (Flamininus);⁵⁷ hence the rôle of agonothele in Italy had not been considered unfitting by emperors before Domitian: in A.D. 42 Claudius presided at the Augustalia, when a comedy in honour of Germanicus was performed;⁵⁸ in A.D. 80–81 Titus was agonothele, also at the Augustalia.⁵⁹ It was the rôle not of agonothele but of participant whereby Nero offended Roman dignity.⁶⁰

Greek-inspired games in themselves proved popular amongst contestants and spectators alike: the Capitoline Games were preserved by Trajan although

⁵¹ Alban Games: RE 1.1 (1893). 867 s. v. Agones (MEIER); Capitoline Games: RE 3.2 (1899). 1527–1530 s. v. Capitolia (WISSOWA).

⁵² THIELE, art. cit. (see note 49), 247.

⁵³ Suet. Nero 12.3: *instituit et quinquennale certamen primus omnium Romae more Graeco triplex, musicum gymnicum equestre, quod appellavit Neronia*; cf. Tac. Ann. 14.20.1.

⁵⁴ Strabo 5.4.7; see R. M. GEER, *The Greek Games at Naples*, TAPhA 66 (1935) 208–221. See also L. ROBERT, *Deux concours grecs à Rome*, CRAI (1977) 6–27, discussing games instituted by Elagabalus and Gordian, but summarising also (pp. 7–9) the evidence for the early empire, and more recently M. CLAVEL-LÉVÊQUE, *L'espace des jeux dans le monde romain: hégémonie, symbolique et pratique sociale*, ANRW II 16.3, ed. W. HAASE, Berlin–New York 1986, 2496 ff.

⁵⁵ Mart. 4.54.1, Juv. 6.387.

⁵⁶ Suet. Dom. 4.4. The *purpurea toga Graecanica* was the triumphal dress worn by Roman emperors in Greek cities, e.g. Claudius in Naples (Dio 60.6) and Hadrian in Athens (Dio 69.16), and on occasions for celebration at Rome, e.g. Nero after the Olympic Games (Suet. Nero 25.1); here the πορφύρεος and gold crown were consciously Hellenic attire for an occasion modelled upon a Greek precedent.

⁵⁷ RE 1.1 (1893). 873 s. v. Agonothetes (REISCH).

⁵⁸ Suet. Claud. 11.2, Dio 60.6.1f.

⁵⁹ CIL 10.1481.

⁶⁰ Tac. Ann. 14.20.1, 21.8; Suet. Nero 12.7; Dio 61.21. C. E. MANNING, *Acting and Nero's Conception of the Principate*, GR II, 22 (1975) 170 ff., remarks that the popular response to Nero's stageappearances was consistently enthusiastic, but the upper classes despised professional public entertainers and all who associated with them; at the most, an aristocrat might appear on stage alongside amateurs; Thræsea Paetus appeared at his native Patavium during a festival held once in thirty years (Tac. Ann. 16.21, Dio 62.26).

hostility to them did exist: Pliny records the opinion of Junius Mauricus, voting for the abolition of *gymnicus agon* at Vienne (Ep. 4.22.3): *vellem etiam Romae tolli posset*. THIELE⁶¹ postulates that opposition may stem from their association with the tyrannical figure of Domitian. The ostensible reason for disapproval was the Roman allegation that Greek gymnastics fostered homosexual tendencies which threatened Roman morals.⁶²

The testimony of the contestants proves the popularity and prestige of the Games. LANA⁶³ postulates separate categories for children and adults on account of the youth of some contestants. At the Augustalia at Naples, different categories for *παῖδες* and *ἄνδρες* are attested in the regulations inscribed at Olympia,⁶⁴ but conceivably this distinction applied only to gymnastic events. The identification of young talent can be ascribed to a taste for sensationalism on Domitian's part or else a genuine concern to encourage literature. Not all the categories which he established for the Capitoline Games were retained.⁶⁵ The literary, rather than oratorical, contests survived; Domitian met a need, fulfilled by the provision of audience, publicity, material reward and prestige.

The introduction of the Alban and Capitoline Games had the effect of building up an Italian games-circuit similar to the great round of Greek games: a professional poet like Statius is known to have appeared at the Augustalia, the Alban and the Capitoline Games, and to have travelled from one centre to the other to compete.⁶⁶ He remarks upon his father's appearance in the Greek circuit and his ensuing reputation;⁶⁷ he records his own achievements at the Augustalia as fulfilling part of his father's ambition for him,⁶⁸ and likewise he depicts success at the Alban and the Capitoline Games as worthy sources of paternal pride.⁶⁹ When Statius reviews his career he treats games-circuit and publication as separate areas of endeavour, which implies that a successful career in public competitions constituted literary renown in its own right.⁷⁰ He presents his success

⁶¹ THIELE, art. cit. (see note 49), 247.

⁶² L. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, tr. L. A. MAGNUS and A. B. GOUGH, London 1907–1913 (henceforward cited as 'Roman Life'), II 122 ff.

⁶³ I. LANA, *I Ludi Capitolini di Domiziano*, RIFC n.s. 29 (1951) 158.

⁶⁴ W. DITTENBERGER and K. PURGOLD, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, Berlin 1896, no. 56.

⁶⁵ By Suetonius' time, at least five categories had been withdrawn (Suet. Dom. 4.4): Greek and Latin prose declamation, lyre-contests (both with chorus and unaccompanied), and the girls' race. For contests and competitors see FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life*, IV 264–267 = App. XLII: 'The Contests in the Capitoline Agon'.

⁶⁶ For Statius' detour to Sorrento en route to Rome after competing in the Augustalia at Naples in 90 see Silv. 2.2.6–12: *huc me post patrii laetum quinquennia lustris / . . . placidi facundia Polli / detulit et nitidae iuvenilis gratia Pollae, / flectere iam cupidum gressus qua limite noto / Appia longarum teritur regina viarum*.

⁶⁷ Stat. Silv. 5.3.113, 141–145.

⁶⁸ Stat. Silv. 5.3.225–227.

⁶⁹ Stat. Silv. 5.3.227–232.

⁷⁰ At Silv. 3.5.28–36 Statius records his success at Alba and his defeat at the Capitoline Games, before mentioning the epic composition which he had been engaged on simultaneously.

at the Alban Games as the summit of his career, subsequently equalled only by the invitation Domitian extended to him to dine at his palace.⁷¹

Statius' prize-winning theme at the Alban Games comprised Domitian's campaigns in Germany and Dacia (Silv. 4.2.66–67): *cum modo Germanas acies modo Dacia sonantem / proelia Palladio tua me manus induit auro*; hence he is celebrating Domitian's triumphs of 89. HÄRTEL⁷² identified this winning poem with Statius' epic 'De Bello Germanico', despite the observation by VOLLMER⁷³ that Statius' epic on Domitian was still only being planned in summer 95. Further, the poem for the Alban contest included the Dacian campaigns; also, a full-scale epic would probably be too long for a contest, unless it were excerpted.

Details have survived of another contestant at the Alban Games: P. Annius Florus.⁷⁴ His entry allegedly concerned the Dacian triumph and incurred Domitian's hostility, and so he lost.⁷⁵ This rumour, true or false, implies that Domitian adjudicated at the function held in his own residence.

It is conceivable that Florus and Statius competed in the same year. Their themes were kindred. Hence, at least when Statius won and when Florus lost, whether or not they were the same occasion, the theme for Latin poetry at the Alban Games either comprised, or at least included, topical propaganda. This accords with the Flavian policy of promoting contemporary literary celebration of their exploits to compensate for their lack of historical tradition. Domitian's presence as adjudicator suggests that the Alban Games performed the function of a talent-contest where the emperor identified suitable candidates for composing on approved themes.

At the Capitoline Games, praise of Jupiter was a regular theme for competitions in Latin oratory.⁷⁶ A composition relating to the mythology of Zeus was performed in the contest for Greek poetry by Q. Sulpicius Claudius Maximus in 94 at the age of eleven; fifty-two contestants participated in this event.⁷⁷ LANA⁷⁸ identifies this theme as a rhetorical exercise, and postulates mythological subjects as the prescription for the Latin poetry section too. The assimilation of Domitian to the godhead of Jupiter is a trend of the 'Silvae' and the 'Epigrams';⁷⁹

⁷¹ Stat. Silv. 4.2.64–67.

⁷² W. HÄRTEL, *Studia Statiana*, diss. Leipzig 1900, 17.

⁷³ F. VOLLMER (ed.), *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri*, Leipzig 1898, 14 n. 3.

⁷⁴ Florus, *Vergilius orator an poeta*, ed. P. JAL, Paris 1967.

⁷⁵ Florus, *ibid.*, blames parochial bias for Domitian's refusal to award him the prize despite the unanimous verdict of the audience: *invito quidem Caesare et resistente, non quod sibi puero invideret, sed ne Africa coronam magni Iovis attingeret*.

⁷⁶ Quint. 3.7.4: *laudes Capitolini Iovis, perpetua sacri certaminis materia*; FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life*, IV 264.

⁷⁷ ILS 5177 = M. MCCRUM and A. G. WOODHEAD, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors*, Cambridge 1961 (henceforward cited as 'Documents'), no. 64.

⁷⁸ LANA, *art. cit.* (see note 63), 158.

⁷⁹ The concept of Domitian's rôle as vice-gerent of Jupiter is documented by SAUTER, *Kaiser-kult*, 54ff. See also J. R. FEARS, *The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology*, ANRW II 17.1, ed. by W. HAASE, Berlin–New York 1981, 74ff. Amongst the general populace the association of Domitian with Jupiter was easily made, see M. BÖS, *Eine Weihung an Jupiter und den Genius Domitians*, BJ 158 (1958) 29–35, discussing an altar-

competition-entries in praise of Jupiter at contests presided over by Domitian may plausibly have encouraged this identification.

Post-Augustan literary circles lamented the absence of a Maecenas. Martial exemplifies this view, making the facile equation of patronage with poetic output (Epig. 8.56.5): *sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones*. Under Nerva he expresses the same nostalgia for Augustan literary conditions (11.3.7–10): *at quam victuras poteramus pangere chartas / quantaque Pieria proelia flare tuba, / cum pia reddiderint Augustum numina terris, / et Maecenatem si tibi, Roma, darent*. These complaints obscure the actual processes of literary output as analysed by WHITE:⁸⁰ the operation of *amicitia* guaranteed that prominent private individuals would continue to sponsor their acquaintances to their mutual advantage. Nostalgia for a Maecenas represents a need for a single personality to co-ordinate literary output with the emperor's interests. The Flavian writers flatter Domitian as sponsor supreme, but his position as emperor made him relatively remote in circumstances which normally promoted the operation of *amicitia*, especially the *cena*; only one occasion is attested when Domitian issued an invitation to a poet, the banquet which Statius celebrates in *Silvae* 4.2, and here there is no hint of any intercourse between host and guest; rather Statius emphasizes the remote grandeur which Domitian cultivated (*Silv.* 4.2.38–42): *sed mihi non epulas Indisque innixa columnis / robora Maurorum famulasque ex ordine turmas, / ipsum, ipsum cupido tantum spectare vacavit / tranquillum vultus et maiestate serena / mulcentem radios*.

So the question remains of how poets had access to the emperor.⁸¹ At *Silv.* 1 Praef. 18–20 Statius manages to combine the façade of his own independence with an imperial initiative; he acknowledges that Domitian requested the presentation of the poem but he simultaneously implies that he had written it on his own initiative: *centum hos versus quos in ecum maximum feci, indulgentissimo imperatori postero die quam dedicaverat opus, tradere iussus sum*. Immediate private presentation, while the poem was still fresh, must apply to all Statius' topical poems; WHITE⁸² notes that *Silv.* 4.1, celebrating Domitian's seventeenth consulship, which he held 1st–13th January 95, would have been out-of-date if Domitian did not see it until the publication of Book 4 in summer 95. Likewise, Statius' thank-you poem (4.2) would not have conveyed any social graces unless he sent it to Domitian straight after the dinner (having presumably prepared it in advance). *Silv.* 4.3 was conceivably first delivered at the opening-ceremony of the Via Domitiana at the triumphal arch where the new road branched off the Via Appia (4.3.97–102); if this hypothesis is correct, the poem was almost certainly commissioned by Domitian.

inscription from Cologne (AE 1960, 87) dated to between 83 and 89, with a joint dedication to Jupiter and *genius imperatoris*.

⁸⁰ P. WHITE, *Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome, JRS 68 (1978) 74–92 (henceforward cited as '*Amicitia*').

⁸¹ WHITE, *Amicitia*, 74, specifically excludes imperial patronage from his discussion.

⁸² P. WHITE, The Presentation and Dedication of the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams*, JRS 64 (1974) 40 (henceforward cited as '*Presentation*').

Martial must also have presented his epigrams to their addressees while they were immediately topical. WHITE⁸³ observes that Epig. 4.1, for Domitian's birthday on 24th October, would have been worse than belated if Domitian had not seen it until Book 4 was published for the Saturnalia in 88.

Not only poems addressed to the emperor were submitted to him for his inspection; at Silv. 4 Praef. 28–29 Statius remarks that many of the poems which comprised Book 4 had already been seen by the emperor prior to their publication in the collection: *deinde multa ex illis iam domino Caesari dederam*. Unless Statius is indulging in hyperbole, *multa* implies more than just the three poems in Book 4 which are addressed to the emperor (Silv. 4.1–3).

WHITE⁸⁴ has identified the *libellus* as the means of circulating material privately prior to publication; the *libellus*, slighter than a full-scale *liber*, fulfilled the dual function of conveying flattery to the addressee while it was fresh, and providing a sample of the poet's writings to which the addressee could react, thus acting as a sounding-board before the poet exposed his material to public opinion. WHITE⁸⁵ observes that since Book 1 of Martial's 'Epigrams' was his first work to be distributed commercially, 1.101 can be interpreted as proof that Martial had already circulated *libelli* to the emperors: *illa manus quondam studiorum fida meorum / et felix domino notaque Caesaribus, / destituit primos viridis Demetrius annos* (1.101.1–3). 2.91, addressed to Domitian, also refers to this process: *si festinatis totiens tibi lecta libellis / detinuere oculos carmina nostra tuos* (2.91.3–4). Such collections would be made up into a suitably lavish copy and presented to the emperor's aide by the duly diffident author; Martial asks the Muses to convey his request to Domitian's *a cubiculo*, Parthenius: *si non est grave nec nimis molestum, / Musae, Parthenium rogate vestrum: / . . . / admittas timidam brevemque chartam / . . . / quae cedro decorata purpuraque / nigris pagina crevit umbilicis* (5.6.1–2, 7, 14–15).

Two circumstances can have prompted the poets to submit their works for imperial perusal: social convention and a genuine literary interest displayed by the emperor. The proportions should be established. Martial sent *libelli* to more than one Flavian emperor (1.101.2, quoted above) and pursued this policy with Nerva (12.4[5].1–4): *longior undecimi nobis decimique libelli / artatus labor est et breve rasis opus. / plura legant vacui, quibus otia tuta dedisti: / haec lege tu, Caesar; forsitan et illa leges*. If Martial could joke to Nerva that he might even go so far as to read the poems (implying that he probably might not), this levity might have been misplaced with Domitian; there is no evidence that Domitian was personally acquainted with Martial.

SZELEST⁸⁶ argues that Martial enjoyed neither recognition nor favour from Domitian, but that at the same time the conventions of the epigrammatic genre protected Martial from having measures taken against him. SZELEST claims that Martial's targets include aspects of Flavian legislation and policy, and that Martial

⁸³ *ibid.*

⁸⁴ WHITE, Presentation, 44–47.

⁸⁵ WHITE, Presentation, 46–47.

⁸⁶ H. SZELEST, Domitian und Martial, *Eos* 62 (1974) 105–114.

was never invited to the palace because Domitian did not approve of him. Further, she interprets⁸⁷ Martial's non-appearance in any Games as a sign that his career did not follow the normal contemporary pattern; but there is no evidence that epigram was a category in any of the poetic contests. She claims⁸⁸ that Vespasian's successful career under Claudius and Nero would make Martial's criticism of these emperors unpopular with Domitian. She has not taken into account evidence that Domitian encouraged satire of Nero: COFFEY⁸⁹ deduces from the extant remains of the satirist Turnus that he used Neronian contexts for his satire.

Statius claims that it is a greater undertaking to submit poems to the emperor for a preview than to publish a collection (Silv. 4 Praef. 28–30): *deinde multa ex illis iam domino Caesari dederam, et quanto hoc plus est quam edere*; in the context of the Praefatio to Book 4, which aims to refute the critics of the first three books, this claim must have more substance than mere flattery of the emperor, and it implies that the court preview entailed a critical appraisal. However, the ultimate arbitration on this book's suitability for publication rests with its dedicatee, Vitorius Marcellus.⁹⁰ It is crucial to establish how Marcellus was qualified to exercise this decision: he was not a literary man but an orator, a soldier and an administrative official;⁹¹ he was not closely acquainted with Statius' literary progress, since Statius reports to him that he has finished the 'Thebaid' (at least three years earlier in 92)⁹² and begun the 'Achilleid' (4.4.87–94); he was an up-and-coming senator, conspicuously loyal to Domitian (4.4.58).

Hence Statius' brief to publish Silvae 4 rests on the support of the emperor and of Vitorius Marcellus. Marcellus' influence consists in his reputation as a prominent public figure favoured by the emperor. But Silvae 4 needed an advocate of its literary worth: on Statius' own admission, the 'Silvae' had a very critical public *qui reprehenderunt, ut audio, quod hoc stili genus edidissem* (4 Praef. 26–27). DELARUE⁹³ argues that the 'Silvae' and the 'Epigrams' were

⁸⁷ SZELEST, art. cit. (see note 86), 107.

⁸⁸ SZELEST, art. cit. (see note 86), 110.

⁸⁹ M. COFFEY, Turnus and Juvenal, BICS 26 (1979) 88–94: Turnus was influential in the courts of Titus and Domitian (Schol. Vall. on Juv. 1.20); the extant fragment (Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum p. 134 MOREL) alludes to the poisoning of Britannicus by Lucusta. Cf. L. DURET, Dans l'ombre des plus grands: II. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de la latinité d'argent, below in this same volume (ANRW II 32.5) 3214 ff.

⁹⁰ Silv. 4 Praef. ad fin. The gist of the corrupt text (variously and unsatisfactorily emended) is that Statius is prepared to withdraw the book if Marcellus will not support him. He defers to Melior's judgement in the same way regarding Book 2 (Silv. 2 Praef. 28–30): *haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerint, a te publicum accipiant; sin minus, ad me revertantur*.

⁹¹ Silv. 4.4.37–45, 64–65, 59–60; Quintilian is speaking of Marcellus' knowledge of oratory when he refers to him *eximio litterarum amore flagrantem* (Inst. Or. 1 Praef. 6). See P. WHITE, Two Statian ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ, CPh 68 (1973) 279–282, PIR V 519; cf. L. DURET, op. cit. (see note 89) 3270 f.

⁹² At Theb. 1.19 Statius refers to Domitian's first two Danubian expeditions; hence publication of the 'Thebaid' is to be dated before the campaign against the Sarmatae in January 93.

⁹³ F. DELARUE, Stace et les « modernes », RPh 48 (1974) 274–301.

criticized partly because of their adulation of Domitian. This type of criticism would be far more likely after the emperor's death. Statius says that the criticism against him was that occasional verse seemed undignified for an epic poet.⁹⁴ So he implies that Domitian's preview accorded Statius the literary sanction he needed for publication.

Even such protestations as Martial's avowal that in Book 8 Domitian inspired him more than ever (8 Epist.), summed up by WHITE⁹⁵ as "a consciously public statement", is evidence that Domitian wanted to be connected in the public mind with literature. If Domitian were motivated solely by a desire for flattery and personal glorification, Martial could not have risked publishing Book 8 in Domitian's lifetime in its extant form where three-quarters of the poems have nothing to do with the emperor. Domitian took notice of Martial; he was rewarded with the *ius trium liberorum*, awarded to him by two emperors.⁹⁶ Similarly Domitian laid on a water-supply at Statius' Alban home (Silv. 3.1.61–64), a privilege which Martial requested for his houses at Nomentum and Rome (Epig. 9.18).

The question of whether imperial approval was a pre-requisite for disseminating literature arises with Silius Italicus. He did not require sponsorship in material respects; his wealth put him in the position of sponsoring others.⁹⁷ He was proconsul of Asia under Vespasian c. 77/78.⁹⁸ Pliny counts him *inter principes civitatis*,⁹⁹ perhaps a select group of *consulares* close to Domitian.¹⁰⁰ His elder son, Decianus, received the consulship from Domitian in 94.¹⁰¹ Silius devoted his retirement to cultural pursuits, including recitations of his own works.¹⁰²

The 'Punica' contain two passages complimentary to Domitian: 3.607–629, 14.686–688. McDERMOTT and ORENTZEL¹⁰³ note that, in a martial epic, praise of Domitian's poetic abilities is unexpected (3.618–621). Hence they assume that Silius' praise was sincere. It seems more likely that, if Domitian had written martial epic, it would be tactless for another epic poet to omit mention of it side by side with praise of Domitian's military achievements. Silius' tributes to Domitian do not come in the proem, unlike the 'Argonautica', 'Thebaid' and 'Achilleid'.

⁹⁴ Silv. 4 Praef. 27, cf. Statius' self-justification that trivial can co-exist with serious work: 1 Praef. 7–10, 4 Praef. 30–32.

⁹⁵ WHITE, Presentation, 58.

⁹⁶ Vespasian and Titus: T. MOMMSEN, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 2³, Leipzig 1887 (repr. Darmstadt 1971), 888 n. 4; Titus and Domitian: FRIEDLÄNDER (see note 47), ad 2.91.5, generally accepted.

⁹⁷ E.g. Martial: Epig. 6.64.10, cf. 4.14; 7.63; 8.66; 9.86; 11.48, 49.

⁹⁸ W. ECK, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian*, Vestigia 13, Munich 1970, 82–83, 124.

⁹⁹ Plin. Ep. 7.3.4.

¹⁰⁰ The term *principes civitatis* may be parallel to *primores civitatis* which implies an élite circle; see F. R. D. GOODYEAR (ed.), *The Annals of Tacitus*, vol. 1, Cambridge 1972, note to 1.54.1.

¹⁰¹ Mart. Epig. 8.66; McCrum and Woodhead, Documents, no. 65: fragment of Fasti Ostienses for the years 94–96.

¹⁰² Plin. Ep. 3.7.8.

¹⁰³ W. C. McDERMOTT and A. E. ORENTZEL, Silius Italicus and Domitian, *AJPh* 98 (1977) 29.

Perhaps Silius is modelling himself upon Vergil,¹⁰⁴ whose tributes to Augustus are scattered within his works.

Although the emperor was sponsor par excellence and there was no Flavian Maecenas, there were court luminaries to be cultivated, prominent amongst them Parthenius, *a cubiculo*¹⁰⁵ to Domitian; to him Martial directed eight epigrams,¹⁰⁶ and Parthenius reciprocated with a toga (8 Praef. 28). Epictetus remarks that tyranny would be more tolerable if the *cubicularii* did not have to be courted as well as the emperor.¹⁰⁷ Domitian's court was associated with people who professed an interest in literature: Earinus, Abascantus, Sextus the librarian.¹⁰⁸ Juvenal parodies the delegation of imperial patronage via court personalities: at Sat. 7.86 ff. Domitian's erstwhile favourite, the mime artiste Paris, is the agent who gets Statius paid; he also distributed military commissions (Sat. 7.88): *militiae multis largitur honorem*.¹⁰⁹ Statius' mime, the 'Agave', may thus be regarded as an imperial commission, the agent being the emperor's favoured confidante. TOWNEND points out that the licence granted to Paris undermines Juvenal's complimentary portrayal of the emperor at the beginning of Satire 7 as supreme patron of the arts. TOWNEND's interpretation seems extreme, determined by the exaggerated stance of satire. Domitian, occupied in state affairs, delegated to officials the task of commissioning at least some works; by alleging that unofficial influence was exerted by a charismatic popular performer, Juvenal does not prove that Domitian surrendered to irresponsible parties all impetus in guiding literary trends.

A Flavian tradition may have stood Martial in good stead: the attention which Vespasian paid to the Spanish provinces. His reasons were primarily political: GAGÉ¹¹⁰ notes that the Gauls had discredited themselves by their affiliations under Vespasian's immediate predecessors, and Spain, having nurtured Galba and Otho, needed to be won over to the Flavian cause. The political necessities were fulfilled, but the policy which Vespasian had promoted was sustained in the cultural sphere by his heirs: prominent under Domitian were Martial, Quintilian, Canius Rufus, Fabius Rusticus.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁴ Silius was almost fanatically devoted to Vergil (Plin. Ep. 3.7.8): *multum ubique librorum, multum statuarum, multum imaginum, quas non habebat modo, verum etiam venerabatur, Vergili ante omnes, cuius natalem religiosius quam suum celebrabat, Neapoli maxime, ubi monimentum eius adire ut templum solebat*. See F. M. AHL, M. A. DAVIS, A. POMEROY, Silius Italicus, above in this same volume (ANRW II 32.4) 2493 ff.

¹⁰⁵ RE 18.4 (1949).1901 s.v. Parthenios 19 (HANSLIK).

¹⁰⁶ Mart. Epig. 5.6., 8.46, 4.45, 4.78, 8.28, 9.49, 11.1, 12.11.

¹⁰⁷ Epict. Diss. 1.19.17–18.

¹⁰⁸ Earinus: Stat. Silv. 3.4, Mart. Epig. 9.11–13, 16–17, 36, see P. WHITE, The Friends of Martial, Statius and Pliny, and the Dispersal of Patronage, HSPH 79 (1975) 288–291; Abascantus: Stat. Silv. 5 Epist.; Sextus: Mart. Epig. 5 Praef. 5.

¹⁰⁹ G. B. TOWNEND, The Literary Substrata to Juvenal's Satires, JRS 63 (1973) 152.

¹¹⁰ J. GAGÉ, Vespasien et la mémoire de Galba, REA 54 (1952) 300.

¹¹¹ Martial from Bilbilis: Epig. 1.61.12; Quintilian from Calagurris: Hieron Chron. 216/4: HELM, 190.19–21; Canius Rufus from Cádiz: Mart. Epig. 1.61.9; Fabius Rusticus from Spain: PIR² F 62, SYME, Tacitus, 179 n. 6. R. K. McELDERRY infers that, political motives

A legacy from Vespasian may also have provided Domitian with the impetus in another case of literary sponsorship: Statius. THIELE,¹¹² remarking upon the elder Papinius' promotion of the Flavian cause, notably in his poem on the fall of the Capitol,¹¹³ suggests that Vespasian's sons inherited from him the obligation to protect the Papinii. Yet it must be noted that Statius nowhere boasts of familiarity with the emperor, and always maintains a respectful distance.

Continuity of attitude within a dynasty is less remarkable than between separate régimes: Titinius Capito, "the Maecenas of Trajan's Rome",¹¹⁴ is postulated by SYME to have attracted Domitian's attention by his talent, his style or his loyalty. He was *ab epistulis* of Domitian, Nerva and Trajan, subsequently (under Trajan) *praefectus vigilum*.¹¹⁵

He recorded the deaths of famous men (Plin. Ep. 8.12.4): *scribit exitus illustrium virorum*; these may have included Junius Blaesus (Tac. Hist. 3.38–39). During Trajan's reign he took an interest in sponsoring literature; he hosted recitations, attended readings, promoted individuals (Plin. Ep. 8.12.1):

colit studia, studiosos amat fovet provehit, multorum qui aliqua componunt portus sinus gremium (sic SCHÄFER: praemium codd.), omnium exemplum; ipsarum denique litterarum iam senescentium reductor ac reformator.

He collected portraits of famous Romans and dedicated poems to them, possibly titular epigrams¹¹⁶ (Plin. Ep. 1.17.3):

est omnino Capioni in usu claros viros colere; mirum est qua religione quo studio imagines Brutorum Cassiorum Catonum domi ubi potest habeat. idem clarissimi cuiusque vitam egregiis carminibus exornat.

Under Vespasian it had been inadvisable to praise Cato, at least in the medium of tragedy (Tac. Dial. 3.2, 10.6); but there is no evidence as to whether Titinius felt constrained not to start his heroes' gallery in Domitian's lifetime.

If republican hero-cults were tolerated, the fashion for imperial martyrs was not. Biography was both popular and hazardous. In the Flavio-Trajanic period, there was a taste for biographies of the recently deceased.¹¹⁷ Under Domitian,

apart, Vespasian recognized and fostered a social and cultural maturity in Spain: Vespasian's Reconstruction of Spain, JRS 8 (1918) 64.

¹¹² THIELE, art. cit. (see note 49), 250.

¹¹³ Stat. Silv. 5.3.199–204.

¹¹⁴ SYME, Tacitus, 93, cit. WHITE, *Amicitia*, 83.

¹¹⁵ ILS 1448.

¹¹⁶ A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *The Letters of Pliny; a historical and social commentary*, Oxford 1966, ad loc., interprets portraits, not busts or death masks, on the analogy of Tac. Ann. 3.76 and Plin. Ep. 4.28.1. H. BARDON, *La Littérature latine inconnue: II. L'Époque impériale*, Paris 1956 (henceforward cited as 'Littérature'), suggests elegiac panegyrics beneath each portrait.

¹¹⁷ Especially death-bed scenes, see SHERWIN-WHITE, note to Plin. Ep. 3.10.1. Under Tiberius and again under Nero there had been a fashion for accounts of the deaths of people who had opposed the régime: see R. M. OGILVIE–I. R. RICHMOND (edd.), *Tacitus Agricola*, Oxford 1967, introduction pp. 13–14.

when this fashion verged on martyr-literature it provoked a reaction from him: although the sources are not unanimous about the charges laid against Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio, they all agree that Arulenus' biography of Thrasea Paetus and Herennius' of the elder Helvidius Priscus contributed to their accusation and execution:¹¹⁸ Tacitus (Agr. 2) records that Arulenus and Herennius eulogized Thrasea and Helvidius respectively, and subsequently these works were banned and their authors executed; Dio 67.13 states that Junius Arulenus Rusticus was executed for his philosophic teaching and for calling Thrasea 'holy' (ἱερόν), and that Herennius Senecio was executed for his biography of Helvidius Priscus and because he stood for no office after the quaestorship;¹¹⁹ Pliny Ep. 7.9.15 states that Senecio's biography was based on documents supplied to him by Helvidius' widow, Fannia.

Otherwise, biography could serve the régime: the life of Arulenus Rusticus by M. Aquilius Regulus was apparently a damaging pamphlet.¹²⁰ Some biography may not have been contentious: Annius Bassus distinguished himself as legate of *legio XI Claudia* in 69;¹²¹ Ti. Claudius Pollio wrote a biography which was a lasting tribute to him.¹²²

History could also allegedly be seditious: Hermogenes of Tarsus was executed because of certain innuendoes in his history, and the copyists were crucified (Suet. Dom. 10.1): *item (occidit) Hermogenem Tarsensem propter quasdam in historia figuras, librariis etiam, qui eam descripserant, cruci fixis*. Quintilian gives an example of a current innuendo referring to a wife's suspected infidelity (9.2.69): *duxi uxorem quae patri placuit*; BAUMAN¹²³ suggests that Quintilian is quoting Hermogenes, and that *patri* is Quintilian's tactful emendation for *fratri*, to be interpreted as a reference to Domitia's liaison with Titus, and he draws a parallel with Domitian's execution of the younger Helvidius, whose farce Domitian had construed as a reflection on his divorce of Domitia.¹²⁴

Roman history written under the Flavians was partisan (Tac. Hist. 2.101.1):

scriptores temporum, qui potente rerum Flavia domo monimenta belli huiusce composuerunt, curam pacis et amorem rei publicae, corruptas in adulationem causas, tradidere.

This accords with the tendency, already noted, to compensate for the Flavians' lack of a Julio-Claudian connection. The most eminent older contemporary of

¹¹⁸ R. A. BAUMAN, *Impietas in Principem*, Münch. Beitr. 67, Munich 1974, 161, deduces that the biographies were mentioned in the indictments, and *laudes* were a specific charge.

¹¹⁹ Under Domitian, as under Nero, the philosophers were persecuted for hero-worship and for non-cooperation with the régime; see J. C. M. TOYNBEE, *Dictators and philosophers in the first century A.D.*, GR 13 (1944) 43–58.

¹²⁰ Plin. Ep. 1.5.2–3.

¹²¹ Tac. Hist. 3.50.2.

¹²² Plin. Ep. 7.31.5–6, noting that credit where credit is due is a refreshing change: *pulchrum istud et raritate ipsa probandum, cum plerique hactenus defunctorum meminerint, ut querantur*; for Ti. Claudius Pollio, see ILS 1418.

¹²³ BAUMAN, op.cit. (see note 118), 162.

¹²⁴ Suet. Dom. 10.4.

Tacitus, in Tacitus' own view, was Fabius Rusticus,¹²⁵ who is not named by Quintilian. But the reference to a distinguished contemporary at Quint. 10.1.104 may well be to him: *superest adhuc et exornat aetatis nostrae gloriam vir saeculorum memoria dignus, qui olim nominabitur, nunc intellegitur*. It is certainly likely that he survived into Domitian's reign.¹²⁶

It is unlikely that Cluvius Rufus was still alive under Domitian.¹²⁷ He conformed to the Flavian outlook,¹²⁸ at least under Vespasian. TOWNEND suggests him as the target for Tacitus' criticism of Flavian partisans (Hist. 2.101 cit. above, cf. 3.86). TOWNEND surmises that Pompeius Planta¹²⁹ may have incurred Pliny's hostility either for the same reason or else if his work contradicted the history *a fine Aufidii Bassi* by the elder Pliny; TOWNEND deduces that he was alive in the second century, and surmises that he may have written under any emperor from Vespasian to Trajan.

Vipstanus Messalla¹³⁰ wrote his autobiography, highly praised by Tacitus (Hist. 3.9). These memoirs included the conflict between Vitellius and Vespasian, a probable source for the Cremona campaign in Tacitus' 'Histories'.¹³¹ They may have been anti-Flavian; Messalla in the 'Dialogus' is strongly conservative and critical of the decline in contemporary standards, particularly the obsession with spectacles and popular entertainment, even in very young children (29.3); this atmosphere contaminates oratory, the fashion prevailing for speeches showy and undignified in style and content (26.2); declamatory exercises are removed from reality (31.1), and depth of ideas is sacrificed to epigrammatic brilliance (32.4): if the times were troubled, meaningful oratory would flourish (37.6).

¹²⁵ PIR² F 62; Tac. Agr. 10.3: *Livius veterum, Fabius Rusticus recentium eloquentissimi auctores*. Cf. L. DURET, op. cit. (see note 89) 3292 ff.

¹²⁶ The Rusticus mentioned at Plin. Ep. 9.29 has not been identified with certainty; SHERWIN-WHITE ad loc. suggests Messius Rusticus, consul in 114, or Fulvius Rusticus, the future senator, who was from Comum or Milan (PIR² F 557); hence BARDON, *Littérature II*, 204, is rash to identify Pliny's man as the historian, connect him with CIL 6. 10 229 (the will of Damasius, A.D. 108) and hence surmise that he was still alive in 108. Even if he is Pliny's man, the fact that Pliny does not say that he is still writing would suggest that his literary activities ceased under the Flavians or soon afterwards.

¹²⁷ Cluvius was consul in 39 or 40 (Jos. Ant. 19.91); SYME, Tacitus, 294.

¹²⁸ G. B. TOWNEND, Cluvius Rufus in the *Histories* of Tacitus, *AJPh* 85 (1964) 342. Cf. L. DURET, op. cit. (see note 89) 3284 ff.

¹²⁹ Pompeius Planta: Plin. Ep. 9.1.1, schol. Juv. 2.99; TOWNEND, art. cit. (see note 128), 342 n. 10.

¹³⁰ F. MÜNZER, Die Entstehung der Historien des Tacitus, *Klio* 1 (1901) 325 f., dates publication of Messalla's memoirs between the composition of Tacitus Hist. 2 and 3, on the grounds that Hist. 2.85 has sparse detail about *legio VII Claudia* which is covered in depth in Book 3; BARDON, *Littérature II* 212, meets this argument by pointing out that: (i) if Tacitus and Messalla were friends, Tacitus could have had access to Messalla's memoirs before they were published; (ii) Tac. Hist. 2.85 omits nothing crucial. The memoirs may indeed have appeared much earlier in Domitian's reign: Messalla was military tribune in 69 (Tac. Hist. 3.9.3); in default of further evidence for his career, SYME (Tacitus, 108) surmises that he may have died prematurely. Cf. also L. DURET, op. cit. (see note 89) 3264 f.

¹³¹ E. PARATORE, Tacito, Milan 1951, 574 ff.

The relation between education and literature under Domitian requires examination. The chief evidence is furnished by Quintilian, who owed his career to Flavian patronage. He came to Rome from Spain in 68 (Hieron. Chron. HELM [2nd edition, 1956] 186.7–8) and retired after twenty years of teaching (Inst. Or. 1 Praef. 1): hence Jerome's date of 88 for the opening of his school at Rome must be corrected to much earlier.¹³²

Vespasian granted the immunity of *ius recipiendi*, exemption from certain administrative offices and their attendant financial responsibilities, to doctors and teachers.¹³³ Fragments of an edict of Vespasian of 74 specify *immunitas*, personal protection and the right to form *collegia*;¹³⁴ the same inscription records a rescript in Latin by Domitian which cancels these privileges in respect of *medici* and *praeceptores* at Pergamum who taught their professional skills to slaves. This cancellation is evidence that Domitian was concerned to preserve standards in the medical and teaching professions by penalizing those who tried to increase their income by giving a cursory training to as many slaves as possible.¹³⁵

Vespasian's educational policy further favoured rhetors (Suet. Vesp. 18): *ingenia et artes vel maxime fovit. primus e fisco Latinis Graecisque rhetoribus annua centena constituit*. COLSON¹³⁶ queries the traditional interpretation of this statement to mean that Vespasian endowed a professor's chair; he suggests that the imperial grant was a subsidy to worthy rhetors. KENNEDY¹³⁷ suggests that Vespasian modelled his subsidy on foundations to support teachers in Greek cities. Juvenal implies that Quintilian also charged fees (Sat. 7.186), but COURTNEY¹³⁸ observes that this may be a feature appropriate to the prototype whom Quintilian represents for Juvenal, rather than a biographical detail. Quintilian was officially decorated; he received the *insignia consularia* via the agency of Flavius Clemens (Aus. Grat. Act. 10.7.204ff.). McDERMOTT and ORENTZEL¹³⁹

¹³² M. L. CLARKE, Quintilian: a Biographical Sketch, GR II, 14 (1967) 31, deduces that Quintilian began teaching immediately upon his arrival in Rome in 68; W. C. McDERMOTT and A. E. ORENTZEL, Quintilian and Domitian, Athenaeum 57 (1979) 13 and n. 19, suggest 72, surmising that Quintilian opened his school when Vespasian granted the subvention to rhetors, dated by Dio 65.12.1a after the double triumph of 71. Cf. J. ADAMIETZ, Quintilians 'Institutio oratoria', above in this same volume (ANRW II 32.4), 2246ff.

¹³³ These privileges were extended to philosophers by Nerva or Trajan, see MIRIAM GRIFFIN, JRS 61 (1971) 279, reviewing G. W. BOWERSOCK, Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire, Oxford 1969: GRIFFIN cites Plin. Ep. 10.58 in which Archippus claimed immunity *ut philosophus* in the reign of Trajan; hence BOWERSOCK (p. 32) is wrong in following Charisius' erroneous attribution of this extension to Hadrian (Dig. 50.4.18.30).

¹³⁴ AE 1936, 128 = McCrum and Woodhead, Documents, no. 458.

¹³⁵ C. A. FORBES, The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity, TAPhA 86 (1955) 349ff. But STEIN (PIR² G 107) gives this inscription a Trajanic date of 108/9. But the original edict must have remained in force, since Hadrian confirmed existing privileges (Dig. 27.1.6.8).

¹³⁶ F. H. COLSON (ed.), Quintilian Book I, Cambridge 1924, xiii.

¹³⁷ G. KENNEDY, Quintilian, New York 1969, 19 (henceforward cited as 'Quintilian').

¹³⁸ E. COURTNEY, A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal, London 1980, ad loc.

¹³⁹ W. C. McDERMOTT and A. E. ORENTZEL, Quintilian and Domitian (see note 132), 24.

suspect that this favoritism aroused consular resentment, citing Pliny's quotation of the preface by Valerius Licinianus, written by 104 (Plin. Ep. 4.11.2): *quos tibi, Fortuna, ludos facis? facis enim ex senatoribus professores, ex professoribus senatores*, and Juv. 7.197: *si Fortuna volet, fies de rhetore consul*. Quintilian is the most illustrious candidate to be target for both jibes; hence their implication is that the arbitrary intervention of the imperial family confers an unfair advantage in the advancement of a career.

Quintilian's highest honour was his appointment by Domitian to tutor his great-nephews and adoptive heirs, two sons of Flavius Clemens.¹⁴⁰ KENNEDY¹⁴¹ interprets this appointment as a manifestation of Domitian's faith in the reputation which Quintilian had won; he bases his conclusion on the plea which Quintilian makes to Domitian, in which the traditional request for the emperor's assistance is expressed as an appeal to Domitian to justify his own faith in Quintilian (Inst. Or. 4 Praef. 5):

in primis . . . numen . . . invocem, ut, quantum nobis expectationis adiecit, tantum ingenii adspiret dexterque ac volens adsit et me qualem esse credidit faciat.

Corroboration of the emperor's esteem of Quintilian might be afforded by his pupils' subsequent careers,¹⁴² but definite evidence is available only for Pliny,¹⁴³ who reached the post of *praefectus aerari militaris*¹⁴⁴ under Domitian. An illustrious contemporary was Vitorius Marcellus, dedicatee of Statius Silvae 4 (see above, p. 3102); from his capacities as *actor causarum* (Silv. 4.4.37–38) HANSLIK¹⁴⁵ infers that he too may have been a pupil of Quintilian.

The 'Institutio' is commonly held to have been published in Domitian's lifetime, because of its complimentary references to him; 96 is the preferred date, because Quintilian is long retired and anticipating death,¹⁴⁶ and by then Domitian's heirs would have been old enough to receive rhetorical training.¹⁴⁷ The opposite conclusion is reached by McDERMOTT and ORENTZEL:¹⁴⁸ they surmise that once Domitian was dead Quintilian waited until emotional attitudes had stabilised before he risked publishing his compliments, an unacceptable deduction

¹⁴⁰ Inst. Or. 4 Praef. 2: *cum vero mihi Domitianus Augustus sororis tuae nepotum delegaverit curam.*

¹⁴¹ G. KENNEDY, An Estimate of Quintilian, AJPh 83 (1962) 133 (henceforward cited as 'An Estimate').

¹⁴² A parallel case may be deduced from the careers of the pupils of Statius' father, Papinius; Statius claims that they vindicate his father's teaching, taking up administrative and military positions throughout the Empire (Silv. 5.3.185–190).

¹⁴³ Pliny calls Quintilian *praeceptore meo* (Ep. 2.14.9); cf. Ep. 6.6.3.

¹⁴⁴ Probably between 94 and 96; see SHERWIN-WHITE, op.cit. (see note 116), 75.

¹⁴⁵ RE Suppl. 9 (1962).1744 s.v. Vitorius Marcellus (HANSLIK).

¹⁴⁶ Inst. Or. 2.12.12, 6 Praef. 2. See J. ADAMIETZ, Quintilians 'Institutio oratoria', above in this same volume (ANRW II 32.4), 2246 ff.

¹⁴⁷ CLARKE, art.cit. (see note 132), 33.

¹⁴⁸ McDERMOTT and ORENTZEL, Quintilian and Domitian (see note 132), 21.

in view of the *damnatio memoriae* which was Domitian's fate.¹⁴⁹ To demonstrate the 'sincerity' of Quintilian's compliments, they remark that this praise of Domitian is limited to two short passages,¹⁵⁰ and they interpret this brevity as proof of Quintilian's sincerity. It could more convincingly be argued that Quintilian did not approve of Domitian, and so two short passages were as far as he was prepared to go in expressing the admiration expected by the régime.

Indeed, KENNEDY¹⁵¹ detects in Book 12 signs that Quintilian felt the oppression at the end of Domitian's reign: at 12.1.40 Quintilian asserts that it is the orator's duty to defend a man accused of plotting against a tyrant; KENNEDY notes that in 91 Maternus had been executed for denouncing tyrants; at 12.2.30 Quintilian maintains that the approval of posterity, not of his contemporaries, should be the ideal. Quintilian confesses that his address to Domitian at 4 Praef. is belated, quoting the precedent of poets who repeated their appeal for divine assistance when they reached an important place in their work; hence (by a distortion of logic) Quintilian asks to be excused for having omitted the initial address (Inst. Or. 4 Praef. 5): *mihi quoque profecto poterit ignosci si, quod initio quo primum hanc materiam inchoavi non feceram, nunc . . . numen . . . invocem*.

KENNEDY¹⁵² believes that Quintilian's recent appointment as imperial tutor forced him to flatter Domitian. The belated address however suggests strongly that Quintilian was in no danger of offending Domitian merely by omitting to flatter him at the beginning of his work; this may indeed have been an impression which Domitian was keen to foster. Indirect flattery is possible through a choice of material and expression; KENNEDY¹⁵³ detects one such subtle compliment in Quintilian's simile at 5.12.17ff., meant to recall Domitian's edict against castration (Suet. Dom. 7); but topicality, rather than flattery, may be the right explanation.

Dedications convey the measure of independence of literary figures under Domitian. Quintilian dedicated the 'Institutio Oratoria' to Vitorius Marcellus, dedicatee also of Statius Silvae 4 (discussed above, p. 3102) and a loyal adherent of Domitian's establishment. An inference to be drawn is that Domitian was not so autocratic in literary matters as to insist that he himself be the dedicatee of contemporary works; his patronage was disseminated more subtly, as recognition for the authors who dedicated works to loyal members of the imperial establishment.

It has been noted by WINTERBOTTOM¹⁵⁴ that Quintilian criticizes the ulterior motives of Flavian orators (i.e. ultimately, delation, cf. Inst. Or. 2.20.2, 4.1.22, 12.7.3). Hence KENNEDY's generalization of Quintilian's aims is a distortion:¹⁵⁵ "what he imagines are Demosthenes and Cicero cheerfully reconciled to

¹⁴⁹ For a collection of defaced inscriptions see GSELL, *op. cit.* (see note 1), ch. 11.

¹⁵⁰ Inst. Or. 4 Praef. 2-3, 10.1.91-92.

¹⁵¹ KENNEDY, Quintilian, 125.

¹⁵² KENNEDY, *An Estimate*, 133.

¹⁵³ KENNEDY, *An Estimate*, 137 n. 24.

¹⁵⁴ M. WINTERBOTTOM, Quintilian and the *Vir Bonus*, JRS 54 (1964) 96.

¹⁵⁵ KENNEDY, *An Estimate*, 146.

Domitian." KENNEDY¹⁵⁶ subsequently, however, modifies his position to accommodate WINTERBOTTOM's thesis. Quintilian is also able to allude to tyrants as subjects for declamation (Inst. Or. 7.2.25, 7.7.3 ff., 7.8.3, 9.2.81 ff.); this is interpreted by BARDON¹⁵⁷ as evidence that Domitian permitted freedom of speech, but the determining factor must be the context: the topos of the tyrant was condoned in declamation, but it was recognized to be dangerous subject-matter for tragedy.¹⁵⁸

AHL¹⁵⁹ has pointed to the rhetorical techniques of double-entendre mentioned by Quintilian,¹⁶⁰ and interprets these *figurae* as evidence that the régime was covertly criticized by these means. The general conclusion must be that Quintilian felt Domitian's autocratic influence but he was not so closely monitored as to be forced into extravagant praise of the emperor.

On the other hand, Domitian is alleged also to have exerted his influence to prevent works of literature being disseminated. Instances of this charge are examined in the next section.

III. Domitian and freedom of expression

Pliny implies that mere compliments did not satisfy Domitian, and he demanded that a formal speech in his honour should extend to *adulatio*.¹⁶¹ Dio alleges that Domitian was hostile to those who did not flatter him (67.4.2). WATERS¹⁶² suggests that Dio invented this charge as a corollary to the psychological truth that flatterers who are despised for their flattery turn hostile, and as support he adduced evidence that Domitian did not welcome *delatores*. But the reputation associated with *delatores* was different from the credit which would accrue to a régime lauded by respected literary talents. Pliny's allegation that

¹⁵⁶ KENNEDY, Quintilian, 138.

¹⁵⁷ BARDON, Empereurs, 312.

¹⁵⁸ At Tac. Dial. 3.2 Secundus assumes that Maternus is revising his *Cato* to remove from it elements which could be interpreted as subversive: *Tum Secundus 'nihilne te,' inquit, 'Materne, fabulae malignorum terrent quo minus offensas Catonis tui ames? an ideo librum istum adprehendisti ut diligentius retractares et, sublati si qua pravae interpretationi materiam dederunt, emitteres Catonem non quidem meliorem, sed tamen securiorem?' Maternus assures him that if the tenor of the Cato was in any doubt, his Thyestes will be uncompromising: quod si qua omisit Cato, sequenti recitatione Thyestes dicet.*

¹⁵⁹ F. M. AHL, The Limits of 'Safe' Criticism under Domitian, paper presented to the American Philological Association, December 1981. Cf. Id., The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome, *AJPh* 105 (1984) 174-208.

¹⁶⁰ Inst. Or. 9.2.65,75, discussed above with note 123.

¹⁶¹ Plin. Pan. 1.6: *tantumque a specie adulationis absit gratiarum actio mea quantum abest a necessitate*; see K. SCOTT, The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship, *TAPhA* 63 (1932) 159.

¹⁶² K. H. WATERS, The Character of Domitian, *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 69.

Domitian demanded *adulatio* matches the extreme antagonism towards him which is manifest in both Pliny and Tacitus, in contrast to the unhindered pursuit of *studia* under Nerva and Trajan.¹⁶³ In his analysis of the decline of literature under the early empire, WILLIAMS¹⁶⁴ emphasizes strongly the stifling effects of autocracy, but he points out also that successful figures like Tacitus and Pliny had compromised by collaborating with Domitian's régime, and so their enthusiastic predictions for the state of literature under Nerva and Trajan may have been made partly to compensate for their co-operation in curbing their tongues under Domitian.

In only one recorded instance is Domitian alleged to have suppressed a work of fiction on the grounds that it allowed of a sinister interpretation: the mythological farce for which the younger Helvidius was executed, in which Domitian suspected allusions to his own divorce (Suet. Dom. 10.4): *occidit et Helvidium filium, quasi scaenico exodio sub persona Paridis et Oenones divortium suum cum uxore taxasset*: it must be observed that the Helvidii's tradition of opposition to the régime created some occasion for Domitian to be suspicious.¹⁶⁵

BARDON¹⁶⁶ observes that Domitian sanctioned the 'Thebaid', with its theme of fraternal conflict, despite the alleged ill-feeling between himself and Titus; he explains this tolerance by observing that the 'Thebaid' was published before Domitian's reign developed into the 'terror'.¹⁶⁷ But a comparison with the action he took against Helvidius Priscus' farce and Hermogenes' history with its *figurae*¹⁶⁸ shows that he was alert for seditious double-entendres, and a broad mythological theme did not threaten his security unless individual aspects were overlaid with a sinister interpretation.

In the case of works with a factual basis, the evidence for censorship is greater. The historian Hermogenes of Tarsus was executed for his double-entendres, and Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio were executed allegedly for their biographies of Stoic martyrs (see above, p. 3106). In the early part of his reign, after he assumed the perpetual censorship, Domitian destroyed a number of libellous pamphlets which discredited prominent men and women, and he did this *non sine auctorum ignominia* (Suet. Dom. 8.3). BAUMAN¹⁶⁹ concludes that *ignominia* refers to a censorial *nota* with which Domitian punished the libellists by exercising *censoria potestas* instead of getting criminal proceedings instituted in cases of defamation.

The orator's freedom of speech under the Republic was muzzled under the Principate, the theme expressed by Maternus in the 'Dialogus' (38.2): . . . *et maxima principis disciplina ipsam quoque eloquentiam sicut omnia pacaverat*.

¹⁶³ Plin. Ep. 1.10.1, 13.1; 3.18.5; Tac. Hist. 1.1.4.

¹⁶⁴ G. WILLIAMS, *Change and Decline*, Berkley and Los Angeles/London 1978, 294–295.

¹⁶⁵ R. S. ROGERS, *A Group of Domitianic Treason-Trials*, CPh 55 (1960) 19–23, concludes likewise that the biographies by Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio of Thræsea Paetus and the elder Helvidius were intrinsically associated with traditional opposition.

¹⁶⁶ BARDON, *Empereurs*, 311–312.

¹⁶⁷ The 'Thebaid' predates January 93, see note 92.

¹⁶⁸ See notes 123 and 124.

¹⁶⁹ BAUMAN, *op. cit.* (see note 118), 167.

WOODSIDE¹⁷⁰ notes that in Vespasian's educational programme oratory had the practical aim of preparing candidates for the shortlist from which public servants were selected. Hence the Flavian emperors were not concerned to foster the innovative and imaginative aspects of oratory as a literary genre. WINTERBOTTOM¹⁷¹ notes the proliferation of important posts occupied by *delatores* in Vespasian's reign; some of these men, notably Vibius Crispus,¹⁷² Cornelius Fuscus,¹⁷³ L. Valerius Catullus Messalinus,¹⁷⁴ M. Aquilius Regulus¹⁷⁵ and Fabricius Veiento,¹⁷⁶ continued to pursue successful careers under Domitian. WINTERBOTTOM concludes that Quintilian's definition of the standards for a perfect orator constitutes his reaction against the Flavian abuse of the oratorical arts. KENNEDY,¹⁷⁷ developing WINTERBOTTOM's thesis, interprets the 'Institutio Oratoria' as Quintilian's best means of living up to his ideals: the training of Domitian's heirs as perfect orators.

The identity of Curiatius Maternus in the 'Dialogus' who claims that contemporary oratory is sterile may have implications for Domitian's attitude to literature. He has been identified by BARNES¹⁷⁸ with the Maternus executed in 91 and described by Dio as a sophist (67.12.5): Μάτερον δὲ σοφιστήν, ὅτι κατὰ τυράννων εἶπε τι ἀσκήων, ἀπέκτεινεν. SYME¹⁷⁹ notes that 91 is too late for Curiatius Maternus still to be declaiming, and thus he cannot qualify as a sophist on those grounds. BARNES identifies the Maternus of the 'Dialogus' with the governor of Moesia and of Syria, adlected *inter praetorios* by Vespasian and Titus,¹⁸⁰ and he surmises that Dio was wrong in calling Maternus a sophist; he reconciles the Maternus of Tacitus and Dio by suggesting that the execution in 91 was precipitated by sudden disgrace while Maternus was governing consular provinces under Domitian, and that his disaffection was 'proved' by the citation of the tragedies he had written in which tyranny was shown to be hubristic. Dio's mistake then would reflect the identification of philosophers (commonly thought to be sophists) with opposition to the régime. But CAMERON¹⁸¹ has argued that the Maternus of the 'Dialogus' died in late 75 or 76, since the dramatic date of the 'Dialogus' is 75, and it was conventional for a literary dialogue to be set just before the death of its chief interlocutor.

¹⁷⁰ M. ST. A. WOODSIDE, *Vespasian's Patronage of Education and the Arts*, TAPhA 73 (1942) 123–129; he cites the speech which Dio (52.26) purports to be by Maecenas, advising Augustus to give priority to the education of senatorial and equestrian classes, the nation's future officials. See also KENNEDY, *An Estimate*, 146.

¹⁷¹ WINTERBOTTOM, *art. cit.* (see note 154), 93.

¹⁷² PIR V 379.

¹⁷³ PIR² C 1365.

¹⁷⁴ PIR V 41.

¹⁷⁵ PIR² A 1005.

¹⁷⁶ PIR² F 91.

¹⁷⁷ KENNEDY, *Quintilian*, 132.

¹⁷⁸ T. D. BARNES, *Curiatius Maternus*, *Hermes* 109 (1981) 382–384.

¹⁷⁹ SYME, *Tacitus*, 799.

¹⁸⁰ CIL 2.3783, 6013; AE 1973, 283.

¹⁸¹ A. CAMERON, *Tacitus and the Date of Curiatius Maternus' Death*, *CR n.s.* 17 (1967) 258–261.

Certain individuals connected with the second sophistic were removed during Domitian's reign. Dio Chrysostom, banished in 82, remained in exile throughout Domitian's lifetime. MOMIGLIANO¹⁸² interprets Or. XXI as a recantation of Dio's former attack on the philosophers; this volte face would account for his banishment. Epictetus was banned from Rome under the edict which expelled the philosophers (Aul. Gell. 15.11.5). STARR¹⁸³ surmises that he was hostile to Domitian on the grounds that he only once mentions Domitian by name and he concentrates on the dangers of autocracy to the exclusion of its merits. MILLAR¹⁸⁴ attributes this attitude not only to his exile but also to his rôle as a philosopher, which required him to criticize the practices of contemporary public life. WATERS¹⁸⁵ contests STARR's view on the grounds that philosophers were traditionally opposed to tyranny, without necessarily encountering it, and the Roman emperor is neither always nor exclusively cited as a tyrant.

The output of Plutarch has been adduced as evidence of Domitian's stranglehold over literature and freedom of speech. Plutarch produced the bulk of his work after the age of fifty; to Domitian's lifetime can be dated only the 'Lives of the Caesars', and perhaps the treatise 'De fraterno amore', or else 'De vitando aere alieno', 'De Amore prolis' and 'Animine an corporis'.¹⁸⁶ JONES¹⁸⁷ allows that Plutarch may have been too busy with lectures and embassies to write, but notes also that he associated with the intellectual circle who cultivated the memory of the Stoic martyrs; he was a friend of Arulenus Rusticus and Avidius Quietus, and admired Junius Mauricus; hence JONES suggests that he may have been banned along with the philosophers in 93/4, or else voluntarily absented himself from Rome. For Plutarch, Domitian exemplified the arrogant, superstitious, spendthrift tyrant, devoid of taste.

It appears that Dio and Epictetus, and perhaps Plutarch too, were removed to prevent their influence spreading, and thus Domitian was forestalling the dissemination of philosophical ideas through literature.

There is no record that Domitian exercised moral censorship, although Martial is at pains to insist that his epigrams do not betoken a licentious existence.¹⁸⁸ A general inhibiting atmosphere during his reign is, however, apparent from the proliferation of versifiers and epigrammatists, attested by Pliny,¹⁸⁹ who emerged in the milder climate of Nerva and Trajan. Martial¹⁹⁰ mentions the erotic poet, Sabellus, in an epigram written under Nerva; in Domitian's reign he men-

¹⁸² A. MOMIGLIANO, Review and discussion of C. WIRSZUBSKI, *Libertas as a political idea at Rome during the late Republic and early Principate*, in: JRS 41 (1951) 153.

¹⁸³ C. G. STARR, *Epictetus and the Tyrant*, CPh 44 (1949) 24.

¹⁸⁴ F. MILLAR, *Epictetus and the Imperial Court*, JRS 55 (1965) 141-148.

¹⁸⁵ WATERS, art. cit. (see note 162), 70 n. 48.

¹⁸⁶ 'De vitando aere alieno', 'De amore prolis', 'Animine an corporis': D. A. RUSSELL, review of JONES (see next note), JRS 62 (1972) 226-227.

¹⁸⁷ C. P. JONES, *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford 1971, 25.

¹⁸⁸ Mart. Epig. 1.4.7-8.

¹⁸⁹ Plin. Ep. 1.10.1, 1.13.1, 3.18.5.

¹⁹⁰ Mart. Epig. 12.43. Cf. DURET, op. cit. (see note 89) 3227f.

tions Sulpicia,¹⁹¹ who wrote poetry celebrating married love. The moral tone of the 'Silvae', celebrating marital fidelity, fecundity and bliss, accords with an imperial concern to publicize sexual morality.

The literature of Domitian's period was determined by two opposing attitudes on the part of the emperor: a concern for literature and a tendency to smother it. But in any case the restrictions on independent expression were already implicit in the imperial system. Domitian however was not insensitive to the blandishments of literature; but where writings implied a political stance, they were not to be borne.

¹⁹¹ Mart. Epig. 10.35, 38. Cf. L. DURET, *op. cit.* (see note 89) 3218 ff.